arXiv:1010.0870v1 [hep-th] 5 Oct 2010

Ambiguity-free formulation of the Higgs-Kibble model.

October 6, 2010

A. Quadri[a,b1], A. A. Slavnov[c2]

[a] Physikalisches Institut
Albert-Ludwigs Universität Freiburg
Hermann-Herder-Strasse 3a,
D-79104 Freiburg i.Br., Germany
[b] Dip. di Fisica, Università degli Studi di Milano
via Celoria 16, I-20133 Milano, Italy
[c] Steklov Mathematical Institute
Gubkina st.8, Moscow, Russia

Abstract

A renormalizable ambiguity-free formulation of the Higgs-Kibble model is proposed.

FR-PHENO-2010-029

---

[1] e-mail: `andrea.quadri@mi.infn.it`
[2] e-mail: `slavnov@mi.ras.ru`

1 Introduction

The problem of ambiguity in the choice of a gauge condition in nonabelian gauge theories is usually associated with the massless Yang-Mills field [1], [2]. In this case the problem of ambiguity is somewhat academic, as the scattering matrix acting in the space of color asymptotic states does not exist because of infrared singularities and the notion of unitarity in the asymptotic space makes no sense.

However the question about an ambiguity in the choice of a gauge condition arises also in the Higgs-Kibble model [3], [4], where infrared singularities are absent and the scattering matrix is well defined in asymptotic space. But the Higgs model in renormalizable gauges like $\partial_\mu A_\mu = 0$ suffers from the same ambiguity problems as the pure Yang-Mills theory. In the unitary gauge the ambiguity may be easily removed by a redefinition of the fields, but the theory in this gauge is not renormalizable.

Recently in the papers ([5], [6], [7]) the new formulation of the Yang-Mills theory was proposed, which allows a unique fixation of the gauge. Therefore the quantization in this gauge makes sense both in perturbation theory and beyond it. Moreover in the paper ([7]) it was shown that the perturbation theory in the ambiguity-free gauge is renormalizable, however the renormalization is not reduced to a multiplicative redefinition of the parameters of the effective action but includes nonmultiplicative redefinition of the fields.

In this paper a similar procedure will be constructed for the Higgs-Kibble model. We shall show that this model may be formulated in a fashion, analogous to the one proposed in the papers ([5], [6], [7])for the pure Yang-Mills field. A possibility of a unique choice of the gauge arises, and the perturbation theory in this gauge is explicitly renormalizable.

2 The Higgs-Kibble model in the ambiguity free gauge

We start with the explicitly gauge invariant model, described by the Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} L = -\frac{1}{4}F^a_{\mu\nu}F^a_{\mu\nu} + (D_\mu\varphi^+)^*(D_\mu\varphi^-) + (D_\mu\varphi^-)^*(D_\mu\varphi^+) \\ +(D_\mu\varphi)^*(D_\mu\varphi) - \lambda^2(\varphi^*\varphi - \mu^2)^2 \\ -[(D_\mu b)^*(D_\mu e) + (D_\mu e)^*(D_\mu b)]\,. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

In the present paper we refer to the gauge group SU(2), however the construction can be generalized to other groups. Here the field φ is a complex doublet describing the Higgs meson, and the fields φ^+, φ^- are auxiliary fields which form analogous doublets, conveniently parametrized by the Hermitean components

$$\Phi = \left(\frac{i\Phi_1 + \Phi_2}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{\Phi_0 - i\Phi_3}{\sqrt{2}}\right) \tag{2}$$

The scalar fields b and e may be also described by the complex doublets, however their components are anticommuting and to provide Hermiticity of the Lagrangian

(1) it is necessary to take the components of the field b antihermitean. D_μ denotes the usual covariant derivative.

It is easy to see that in the vacuum sector for the fields $\varphi^\pm, b, e$ the path integral for the scattering matrix corresponding to the Lagrangian (1) reduces to the path integral for the usual Higgs-Kibble model. In the integral

$$\int \exp\{i \int L \, d^4x\} d\mu \tag{3}$$

where $d\mu$ includes also the product of the differentials of the auxiliary fields $\varphi_\pm, b, e$, one may integrate explicitly over these fields. After that the integral (3) coincides with the path integral for the Higgs-Kibble model.

We however are going to do in the Lagrangian (1) a shift of the fields φ and φ^-, leading to a spontaneous breaking of the symmetry. Such a transformation is not an admissible change of variables in the integral (3), as it changes the asymptotic values of the integration variables. Therefore the unitarity of the "shifted" theory requires a special study.

After the shift

$$\varphi^-(x) \to \varphi^-(x) - \hat{m}; \quad \varphi(x) \to \varphi(x) - \hat{\mu} \tag{4}$$

where $\hat{m}$ and $\hat{\mu}$ are the constant spinors

$$\hat{m} = (0, m/g); \quad \hat{\mu} = (0, \mu/g) \tag{5}$$

the Lagrangian (1) acquires the form

$$\begin{aligned} L = -\frac{1}{4} F^a_{\mu\nu} F^a_{\mu\nu} + (D_\mu \varphi^+)^* (D_\mu \varphi^-) + (D_\mu \varphi^-)^* (D_\mu \varphi^+) \\ -[(D_\mu \varphi^+)^* (D_\mu \hat{m}) + (D_\mu \hat{m})^* D_\mu \varphi^+] \\ -[(D_\mu b)^* (D_\mu e) + (D_\mu e)^* (D_\mu b)] + (D_\mu \varphi)^* (D_\mu \varphi) \\ -[(D_\mu \varphi)^* (D_\mu \hat{\mu}) + (D_\mu \hat{\mu})^* (D_\mu \varphi)] \\ +(D_\mu \hat{\mu})^* (D_\mu \hat{\mu}) - \lambda^2 [(\varphi - \hat{\mu})^* (\varphi - \hat{\mu}) - \mu^2]^2 . \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

The last terms in this equation, starting from the term $(D_\mu \varphi)^* (D_\mu \varphi)$ coincide identically with the corresponding terms of the Higgs-Kibble model. In particular the presence of the term $(D_\mu \hat{\mu})^* (D_\mu \hat{\mu})$ results in the mass term for the Yang-Mills field $\frac{\mu^2}{2} A^a_\mu A^a_\mu$.

The Lagrangian (6) being obtained by the shift from the gauge invariant lagrangian (1) obviously is invariant with respect to the "shifted" gauge transformations. In particular the fields φ^a_- and φ^a are transformed as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \varphi^a_- &= m \eta^a + \frac{g}{2} \epsilon^{abc} \varphi^b_- \eta^c + \frac{g}{2} \varphi^0_- \eta^a \\ \delta \varphi^a &= \mu \eta^a + \frac{g}{2} \epsilon^{abc} \varphi^b \eta^c + \frac{g}{2} \varphi^0 \eta^a \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

As the fields φ^a and φ^a_- under the gauge transformations are shifted by arbitrary functions $m\eta^a$ and $\mu\eta^a$ one can impose a gauge condition on any of these fields.

If one makes firstly in the classical Lagrangian the following change of variables

$$\begin{gathered}\varphi^0_- = \frac{2m}{g}(\exp\{\frac{gh}{2m}\} - 1); \quad \varphi^a_- = \tilde{M}\tilde{\varphi}^a_- \\ \varphi^a_+ = \tilde{M}^{-1}\tilde{\varphi}^a_+; \quad \varphi^0_+ = \tilde{M}^{-1}\tilde{\varphi}^0_+ \\ e = \tilde{M}^{-1}\tilde{e}; \quad b = \tilde{M}\tilde{b}\end{gathered} \tag{8}$$

where

$$\tilde{M} = 1 + \frac{g}{2m}\varphi^0_- = \exp\{\frac{gh}{2m}\} \tag{9}$$

and impose the gauge condition

$$\tilde{\varphi}^a_- = 0 \tag{10}$$

then under the gauge transformations

$$\delta\tilde{\varphi}^a_- = m\eta^a \tag{11}$$

and Gribov ambiguity is absent.

The effective Lagrangian in the gauge (10) looks as follows

$$\begin{gathered}\tilde{L} = -\frac{1}{4}F^a_{\mu\nu}F^a_{\mu\nu} + \partial_\mu h\partial_\mu\tilde{\varphi}^0_+ - \frac{g}{2m}\partial_\mu h\partial_\mu h\tilde{\varphi}^0_+ \\ +m\tilde{\varphi}^a_+\partial_\mu A^a_\mu - [((D_\mu\tilde{b})^* + \frac{g}{2m}\tilde{b}^*\partial_\mu h)(D_\mu\tilde{e} - \frac{g}{2m}\tilde{e}\partial_\mu h) + h.c.] \\ +\frac{mg}{2}A^2_\mu\tilde{\varphi}^0_+ + g\partial_\mu hA^a_\mu\tilde{\varphi}^a_+ + \frac{\mu^2}{2}A^a_\mu A^a_\mu + \mu\varphi^a\partial_\mu A^a_\mu + \ldots\end{gathered} \tag{12}$$

Out of the terms which arise in the Higgs-Kibble model after the shift of the field φ^0 we have only displayed explicitly in eq.(12) the mass term for the gauge field and the Goldstone-gauge boson bilinear. The other terms are denoted by $\ldots$.

As one sees the free Lagrangian corresponding to (12) differs from the free Lagrangian corresponding to the massless Yang-Mills field by the presence of the mass term $\frac{\mu^2}{2}A^a_\mu A^a_\mu$, the mixed term $\mu\varphi^a\partial_\mu A^a_\mu$ and the free Lagrangian for the Higgs field φ. The mixed term may be removed by the change of variables

$$\tilde{\varphi}^a_+ \to \tilde{\varphi}^a_+ - \frac{\mu}{m}\varphi^a \tag{13}$$

Resulting free propagators look as follows

$$\begin{gathered}\Delta(A^a_\mu A^b_\nu) = \frac{-i\delta^{ab}}{p^2 - \mu^2}T_{\mu\nu}, \quad \Delta(A^a_\mu\tilde{\varphi}^b_+) = -\delta^{ab}\frac{p_\mu}{mp^2}, \quad \Delta(\tilde{\varphi}^0_+ h) = \frac{i}{p^2} \\ \Delta(\tilde{b}^0\tilde{e}^0) = \frac{i}{p^2}, \quad \Delta(\tilde{b}^a\tilde{e}^b) = \frac{i\delta^{ab}}{p^2}, \quad \Delta(\varphi^0\varphi^0) = \frac{i}{p^2 - M^2_H}, \quad \Delta(\varphi^a\varphi^b) = \delta^{ab}\frac{i}{p^2}\end{gathered} \tag{14}$$

Here $T_{\mu\nu}$ is the transversal projector. We also set $M^2_H = 4\lambda^2\mu^2$ for the mass squared of the physical Higgs mode. It is not difficult to calculate the divergency index of an arbitrary diagram. It is equal to

$$n = 4 - 2L_{\varphi^0_+} - 2L_{\varphi^a_+} - L_A - L_e - L_b - L_h - L_{\varphi^a} - L_{\varphi^0} \tag{15}$$

The divergent diagrams may have no more than four external lines, that is the model is manifestly renormalizable.

3 Unitarity

The Lagrangian obtained from eq.(6) after the change (4) includes a number of unphysical exitations corresponding to the ghost fields $\varphi_+^a, \varphi_+^0, h, \varphi^a, e, b$ and zero components of the Yang-Mills field. It is necessary to show that the scattering matrix nevertheless is unitary in the physical sector which includes only three components of the massive Yang-Mills field and one massive Higgs scalar.

As in the case of the massless Yang-Mills theory the crucial role here is played by the supersymmetry of the Lagrangian (1). This Lagrangian is invariant with respect to the supersymmetry transformations

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\varphi_-^a &= -b^a \\
\delta\varphi_-^0 &= -b^0 \\
\delta e^a &= \varphi_+^a \\
\delta e^0 &= \varphi_+^0 \\
\delta b &= 0 \\
\delta\varphi_+ &= 0
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

In terms of the variables $\tilde\varphi$ the supersymmetry transformations acquire the form

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta h &= -\tilde b^0 \\
\delta\tilde\varphi_-^a &= -\tilde b^a + \frac{g}{2m}\tilde\varphi_-^a\tilde b^0 \\
\delta\tilde\varphi_+^a &= -\frac{g}{2m}\tilde b^0\tilde\varphi_+^a \\
\delta\tilde\varphi_+^0 &= -\frac{g}{2m}\tilde b^0\tilde\varphi_+^0 \\
\delta\tilde e^a &= \tilde\varphi_+^a + \frac{g}{2m}\tilde e^a\tilde b^0 \\
\delta\tilde e^0 &= \tilde\varphi_+^0 + \frac{g}{2m}\tilde e^0\tilde b^0 \\
\delta\tilde b^a &= -\frac{g}{2m}\tilde b^a\tilde b^0 \\
\delta\tilde b^0 &= 0
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

The Lagrangian (6) after the change of variables (8) is invariant with respect to the corresponding BRST transformation and the supersymmetry transformation (17). Obviously it is also invariant with respect to the simultaneous change of the fields combining these two transformations. It allows to use instead of the canonical gauge fixing the following gauge fixing

$$s^1\int d^4x\ \bar c^a\tilde\varphi_-^a = \int d^4x(\lambda^a\tilde\varphi_-^a - \bar c^a(M^{ab}c^b - \tilde b^a))\,, \tag{18}$$

where s_1 is the nilpotent operator, similar to the BRST operator, defined by the gauge transformation, leaving invariant the Lagrangian (6)written in terms of the transformed variables and

$$\begin{aligned}(s_1c)^a &= -\frac{g}{2}\varepsilon^{abc}c^bc^c \\ (s_1\bar{c})^a &= \lambda^a \\ (s_1\lambda)^a &= 0\,. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Note that this modification does not change our conclusion about the renormalizability of the theory.

Therefore the scattering matrix is given by the path integral

$$S = \int \exp\{i\int[L+\lambda^a\tilde{\varphi}^a + m\bar{c}^ac^a + \tilde{b}^a\bar{c}^a]d^4x\}d\mu \tag{20}$$

where the boundary conditions are imposed on all the fields entering the effective action except for the ultralocal ghost fields $\bar{c}, c, \lambda$. Performing explicit integration over $\bar{c}^a, c^a$ we obtain in the exponent the effective action which is invariant with respect to the modified BRST transformations corresponding to the usual BRST transformations and the supersymmetry transformations (17) after the substitution $c^a = \frac{\tilde{b}^a}{m}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta A^a_\mu &= \frac{1}{m}(D_\mu\tilde{b})^a \\ \delta\tilde{\varphi}^a_- &= 0 \\ \delta h &= -\tilde{b}^0 \\ \delta\tilde{\varphi}^a_+ &= \frac{g}{2m}\tilde{\varphi}^0_+\tilde{b}^a + \frac{g}{2m}\varepsilon^{abc}\tilde{\varphi}^b_+\tilde{b}^c - \frac{g}{2m}\tilde{\varphi}^a_+\tilde{b}^0 \\ \delta\tilde{\varphi}^0_+ &= -\frac{g}{2m}(\tilde{\varphi}^a_+\tilde{b}^a + \tilde{\varphi}^0_+\tilde{b}^0) \\ \delta\tilde{e}^a &= \frac{g}{2m}(\tilde{e}^a\tilde{b}^0 - \tilde{e}^0\tilde{b}^a - \varepsilon^{abc}\tilde{e}^b\tilde{b}^c) + \tilde{\varphi}^a_+ \\ \delta\tilde{b}^0 &= 0 \\ \delta\tilde{e}^0 &= \frac{g}{2m}(\tilde{e}^a\tilde{b}^a + \tilde{e}^0\tilde{b}^0) + \tilde{\varphi}^0_+ \\ \delta\tilde{b}^a &= -\frac{g}{2m}\varepsilon^{abc}\tilde{b}^b\tilde{b}^c \\ \delta\varphi^a &= \mu\frac{\tilde{b}^a}{m} + \frac{g}{2m}\varepsilon^{abc}\varphi^b\tilde{b}^a + \frac{g}{2m}\tilde{b}^a\varphi^0 \\ \delta\varphi^0 &= -\frac{g}{2m}\tilde{b}^a\varphi^a \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

The invariance of the effective action with respect to the transformation (21) according to Noether theorem leads to the existence of the conserved nilpotent charge Q, which allows to separate the physical space by requiring its annihilation by the operator Q:

$$Q|\Phi>_{phys} = 0 \tag{22}$$

where $|\Phi>_{phys}$ cannot be presented in the form

$$|\Phi>_{phys} = Q|\Psi>\ . \tag{23}$$

For asymptotic states this condition is reduced to

$$Q^0|\Phi>_{as}=0\,,\qquad |\Phi>_{as}\neq Q^0|\Psi>\,, \tag{24}$$

where Q^0 is the free charge acting on the fields as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
Q^0A^a_\mu &= \frac{\partial_\mu \tilde{b}^a}{m}\\
Q^0\tilde{e}^a &= \tilde{\varphi}^a_+\\
Q^0\tilde{\varphi}^a_+ &= 0\\
Q^0\varphi^a &= \frac{\tilde{b}^a}{m}\\
Q^0\tilde{b}^a &= 0\\
Q^0\varphi^0 &= 0\\
Q^0\tilde{e}^0 &= \tilde{\varphi}^0_+\\
Q^0\tilde{\varphi}^0_+ &= 0\\
Q^0h &= -\tilde{b}^0\\
Q^0\tilde{b}^0 &= 0
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

If one identifies the field $\tilde{e}^a$ with the antighost field $\bar{c}^a$ in the ordinary Higgs-Kibble model, and the field $\frac{1}{m}\tilde{b}^a$ with the ghost field c^a, the first six transformations coincide with the BRST transformations in the Higgs-Kibble model, thus providing the decoupling of the fields $\tilde{\varphi}^a_+, \tilde{e}^a, \tilde{b}^a, \varphi^a$ and unphysical components of the Yang-Mills field from the physical states. The remaining transformations provide the decoupling of the fields e^0, h, b^0, φ^0_+. Ultralocal fields $\lambda^a, \bar{c}^a, c^a$ do not contribute to the asymptotic states.

Therefore our model has the same spectrum of observables as the standard Higgs-Kibble model. However to conclude that our model is equivalent to the usual one, one should prove that renormalization preserves the formal relations obtained above.

4 Renormalization

The action $S=\int d^4x\,\tilde{L}$, where $\tilde{L}$ denotes the effective Lagrangian corresponding to the effective action in the exponent of (20) after integration over $\bar{c}, c$, is invariant under the transformations eq.(21) and under a global SU(2) symmetry of the fields $A^a_\mu, \tilde{\varphi}^a_+, \tilde{e}, \tilde{b}, \varphi$. However there are further terms that respect the invariance under the transformations (21) and the residual global SU(2) invariance and are not forbidden by power counting. The first one does not involve the Higgs doublet φ and is common to the massless Yang-Mills theory quantized in the ambiguity-free gauge [7]

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G} \;=\; \int d^4x\,\Big[&(\tilde{\varphi}^0_+)^2+(\tilde{\varphi}^a_+)^2+\frac{g}{m}\tilde{\varphi}^0_+(\tilde{e}^0\tilde{b}^0+\tilde{e}^a\tilde{b}^a)+\frac{g}{m}\tilde{\varphi}^a_+(\tilde{e}^a\tilde{b}^0-\tilde{e}^0\tilde{b}^a-\varepsilon^{abc}\tilde{e}^b\tilde{b}^c)\\
&-\frac{g^2}{2m^2}\Big(-(2\tilde{e}^0\tilde{b}^0+\tilde{e}^a\tilde{b}^a)\tilde{e}^b\tilde{b}^b+\varepsilon^{abc}\tilde{e}^0\tilde{b}^b\tilde{e}^c\tilde{b}^a-\varepsilon^{abc}\tilde{e}^b\tilde{b}^0\tilde{e}^c\tilde{b}^a\Big)\Big]\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Eq.(26) holds in the gauge $\tilde{\varphi}_a^- = 0$. It can be made gauge-invariant by performing the substitution

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{\varphi}_+^0 \to \tilde{\varphi}_+^0 + \frac{g}{2m}\tilde{\varphi}_-^a\tilde{\varphi}_+^a\,, \qquad \tilde{\varphi}_+^a \to \tilde{\varphi}_+^a - \frac{g}{2m}\tilde{\varphi}_-^a\tilde{\varphi}_+^0 + \frac{g}{2m}\varepsilon^{abc}\tilde{\varphi}_-^b\tilde{\varphi}_+^c\,,\\
&\tilde{e}^0 \to \tilde{e}^0 + \frac{g}{2m}\tilde{\varphi}_-^a\tilde{e}^a\,, \qquad \tilde{e}^a \to \tilde{e}^a - \frac{g}{2m}\tilde{\varphi}_-^a\tilde{e}^0 + \frac{g}{2m}\varepsilon^{abc}\tilde{\varphi}_-^b\tilde{e}^c\,,\\
&\tilde{b}^0 \to \tilde{e}^0 + \frac{g}{2m}\tilde{\varphi}_-^a\tilde{b}^a\,, \qquad \tilde{b}^a \to \tilde{b}^a - \frac{g}{2m}\tilde{\varphi}_-^a\tilde{b}^0 + \frac{g}{2m}\varepsilon^{abc}\tilde{\varphi}_-^b\tilde{b}^c\,. \qquad (27)
\end{aligned}$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G} \;=\; &\int d^4x\,\Big[\Big(\tilde{\varphi}_+^0 + \frac{g}{2m}\tilde{\varphi}_-^a\tilde{\varphi}_+^a + \frac{g}{2m}(\tilde{e}^0\tilde{b}^0 + \tilde{e}^a\tilde{b}^a)\Big)^2\\
&+\Big(\tilde{\varphi}_+^a - \frac{g}{2m}\tilde{\varphi}_+^0\tilde{\varphi}_-^a - \frac{g}{2m}\varepsilon^{abc}\tilde{\varphi}_-^b\tilde{\varphi}_+^c + \frac{g}{2m}(\tilde{e}^a\tilde{b}^0 - \tilde{e}^0\tilde{b}^a - \varepsilon^{abc}\tilde{e}^b\tilde{b}^c)\Big)^2\Big]\,. \qquad (28)
\end{aligned}$$

A further solution exists

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G}_1 \;=\; &\int d^4x\,\Big(\tilde{\varphi}_+^0[(\varphi-\hat{\mu})^*(\varphi-\hat{\mu}) - \mu^2]\\
&\qquad + \frac{g}{2m}(\tilde{e}^a\tilde{b}^a + \tilde{e}^0\tilde{b}^0)[(\varphi-\hat{\mu})^*(\varphi-\hat{\mu}) - \mu^2]\Big)\,. \qquad (29)
\end{aligned}$$

It can be made gauge-invariant by performing the substitution eq.(27). This yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G}_1 \;=\; &\int d^4x\,\Big(\Big(\tilde{\varphi}_+^0 + \frac{g}{2m}\tilde{\varphi}_-^a\tilde{\varphi}_+^a\Big)[(\varphi-\hat{\mu})^*(\varphi-\hat{\mu}) - \mu^2]\\
&\qquad + \frac{g}{2m}(\tilde{e}^a\tilde{b}^a + \tilde{e}^0\tilde{b}^0)[(\varphi-\hat{\mu})^*(\varphi-\hat{\mu}) - \mu^2]\Big)\,. \qquad (30)
\end{aligned}$$

The new effective action becomes

$$A_{eff} = \int d^4x\,\tilde{L} + \frac{m^2}{2}\alpha\mathcal{G} + \frac{mg}{2}\beta\mathcal{G}_1\,. \qquad (31)$$

The factors of m in the above equation have been inserted for dimensional reasons. α and β are dimensionless free parameters.

The quadratic part of A_{eff} is

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{eff,0} = &\int d^4x\,\Big(-\frac{1}{4}(\partial_\mu A_\nu^a - \partial_\nu A_\mu^a)^2 + \frac{\mu^2}{2}(A_\mu^a)^2 + \mu\varphi^a\partial A^a\\
&+m\tilde{\varphi}_+^a\partial A^a + \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\varphi^a\partial_\mu\varphi^a + \frac{\alpha}{2}m^2(\tilde{\varphi}_+^a)^2\\
&+\frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\varphi_0\partial_\mu\varphi_0 - \frac{M_H^2}{2}\varphi_0^2 + \beta\mu m\varphi_0\tilde{\varphi}_0^+ + \frac{\alpha m^2}{2}(\tilde{\varphi}_0^+)^2 - \tilde{\varphi}_0^+\Box h + \partial_\mu\tilde{e}^\alpha\partial_\mu\tilde{b}^\alpha\Big)\,. \qquad (32)
\end{aligned}$$

where α ranges over $0, a$. We get the following non-vanishing propagators:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Delta(A_\mu^a A_\nu^b) = i\delta^{ab}\Big(\frac{1}{-p^2+\mu^2}T_{\mu\nu} - \frac{\alpha}{p^2}L_{\mu\nu}\Big)\,, \quad \Delta(A_\mu^a\varphi^b) = \delta^{ab}\frac{i\alpha\mu}{p^4}p_\mu\,,\\
&\Delta(\varphi^a\varphi^b) = \delta^{ab}\frac{i}{p^4}(p^2 - \alpha\mu^2)\\
&\Delta(A_\mu^a\tilde{\varphi}_+^b) = -\delta^{ab}\frac{p_\mu}{mp^2}\,, \quad \Delta(\tilde{b}^a\tilde{e}^b) = \frac{i\delta^{ab}}{p^2}\,. \qquad (33)
\end{aligned}$$

They are the same as those obtained in the Higgs-Kibble model in the Lorentz covariant α-gauge once $\tilde{\varphi}_a^+$ is identified with the Nakanishi-Lautrup field. Hence in this sector the physical fields coincide with the physical fields in the corresponding sector of the ordinary Higgs-Kibble model, that is include three components of the massive vector field A_μ.

The non-vanishing propagators in the sector spanned by the fields $h, \tilde{\varphi}_0^+, \varphi_0$ are given by

$$\Delta(hh) = -\frac{i\alpha m^2}{p^4} - \frac{i\beta^2 m^2 \mu^2}{p^4(p^2 - M_H^2)}\,, \quad \Delta(h\tilde{\varphi}_+^0) = \frac{i}{p^2}\,,$$
$$\Delta(h\varphi^0) = -\frac{i\beta\mu m}{p^2(p^2 - M_H^2)}\,, \quad \Delta(\varphi_0\varphi_0) = \frac{i}{p^2 - M_H^2}\,, \quad \Delta(\tilde{b}^0\tilde{e}^0) = \frac{i}{p^2}\,. \tag{34}$$

The new terms in eq.(31) do not modify the structure of the nilpotent charge Q^0 in eq.(24). Thus physical unitarity follows as in Sect. 3 and we conclude that the only physical states are the three components of the massive gauge field and the massive scalar Higgs particle.

Additional divergencies are presented by the tadpole term

$$\mathcal{T} = \int d^4x \left[(\varphi - \hat{\mu})^*(\varphi - \hat{\mu}) - \mu^2\right]. \tag{35}$$

and the similar term for $\tilde{\varphi}_+^0$. To fulfill all the symmetries of the theory it must have the form

$$\mathcal{I}_t = \int d^4x \left(\frac{g}{2m}(\tilde{e}^a\tilde{b}^a + \tilde{e}^0\tilde{b}^0) + \tilde{\varphi}_+^0 + \frac{g}{2m}\tilde{\varphi}_-^a\tilde{\varphi}_+^a\right). \tag{36}$$

So we are finally led to study the following effective action

$$A'_{eff} = \int d^4x\, \mathcal{L} + \frac{m^2}{2}\alpha\mathcal{G} + \frac{mg}{2}\beta\mathcal{G}_1 + t\mathcal{T} + \tilde{t}\mathcal{I}_t\,. \tag{37}$$

The invariant in eq.(35) allows to adopt the normalization condition on the 1-PI vertex functional

$$\frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta\varphi_0} = 0 \tag{38}$$

to all orders in the loop expansion. This is the choice adopted at tree level in eq.(1).

Therefore the physical asymptotic sector includes three components of the massive vector field and one massive scalar.

The renormalizability of the theory after inclusion of the terms (26,29) follows directly from the Feynman rules in the effective action (37) and the propagators (33,34) which lead to the same expression for the divergency index as before.

5 Structure of the counterterms

In this Section we will prove that the UV divergences of the theory can be removed only by changing the values of the parameters entering into the effective action (37) (modulo field redefinitions). Moreover this procedure does not violate the symmetries of theory, i.e. the invariance generated by the transformation in eq.(21) and the residual global SU(2) symmetry.

In order to study the structure of the counterterms in the gauge $\tilde{\varphi}^a_- = 0$ let us introduce the tree-level vertex functional $\Gamma^{(0)}$, including apart from the classical action A'_{eff} in eq.(37) also the variation of the fields Φ under the transformation (21), coupled to the external sources Φ^* (the antifields [8]). Then the invariance under the transformation (21) is translated into the following functional identity

$$\mathcal{S}(\Gamma) = \int d^4x \sum_{\Phi} \frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta \Phi^*(x)} \frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta \Phi(x)} = 0 \,. \tag{39}$$

The vertex functionl Γ can be developed in the number of loops, i.e. $\Gamma = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \hbar^j \Gamma^{(j)}$.

Assuming that a gauge-invariant regularization exists, the effective action $\hat{\Gamma}$ including all the counterterms also fulfills the same functional identity

$$\mathcal{S}(\hat{\Gamma}) = 0 \,. \tag{40}$$

In addition the residual global SU(2) invariance is also respected. By taking into account power-counting bounds the most general solution to eq.(40) which is invariant under the residual global SU(2) symmetry is obtained from $\Gamma^{(0)}$ upon redefinition of the free parameters

$$\begin{aligned} & g' = Z_g g \,, \quad m' = Z_m m \,, \quad t' = Z_t t \,, \quad \tilde{t}' = Z_{\tilde{t}} \tilde{t} \,, \quad \alpha' = \frac{Z_\alpha}{Z_g^2} \alpha \,, \\ & \beta' = \frac{Z_\beta}{Z_g Z_m} \beta \,, \quad \lambda' = Z_\lambda \lambda \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

and by performing a field redefinition which preserves the residual global SU(2) invariance and the UV counting

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{e}' = Z_1 \tilde{e} \,, \quad \tilde{b}' = Z_m \tilde{b} \,, \quad A^{a'}_\mu = Z_2 A^a_\mu \,, \quad h' = Z_m Z_3 h \,, \\ & \varphi^{0'} = z_1 \varphi^0 \,, \quad \varphi^{a'} = z_1 \varphi^a \,, \\ & \tilde{\varphi}^{a'}_+ = Z_4 \tilde{\varphi}^a_+ + Z_5 \partial A^a + Z_6 \frac{1}{m} \partial_\mu h A^{a\mu} + Z_7 (\tilde{e}^0 \tilde{b}^a - \tilde{e}^a \tilde{b}^0 - \varepsilon^{abc} \tilde{e}^b \tilde{b}^c) \,, \\ & \tilde{\varphi}^{0'}_+ = Z_8 \tilde{\varphi}^0_+ + Z_9 \frac{1}{m} \Box h + Z_{10} \frac{1}{m^2} \partial_\mu h \partial^\mu h + Z_{11} A^2 + Z_{12} (\tilde{e}^0 \tilde{b}^0 + \tilde{e}^a \tilde{b}^a) \\ & \qquad + z_2 \Big[(\varphi_0 + \mu)^2 + \varphi_a^2 - \mu^2 \Big] \,. \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

In the above equation we have kept the notation of capital Z's for those field redefinition constants which are common with the massless YM case [7]. Moreover we have introduced small z's for the new field redefinitions. One should notice that the residual global SU(2) symmetry imposes several non-trivial constraints: it forbids a term proportional to the gradient of φ^a in the redefinition of the gauge field A^a_μ (which on the contrary is present in the standard 't Hooft gauge since the latter breaks explicitly the residual global SU(2) symmetry) and excludes the appearance of terms proportional to φ^a and $\varphi^0\varphi^a$ in the redefinition of $\tilde\varphi^a_+$, which would be otherwise allowed by the power-counting. Moreover it selects the invariant $((\varphi_0+\mu)^2+\varphi_a^2-\mu^2)$ as the unique combination which can enter the field redefinition of $\tilde\varphi^0_+$.

The field redefinition in eq.(42) must be implemented without violating the functional identity (40). A convenient way is to make use of canonical transformations as in [7]. For that purpose we rewrite the functional identity (40) by means of the following bracket [9]

$$(X,Y) = \int d^4x \sum_\Phi (-1)^{\epsilon(\Phi)\epsilon(X)} \Big(\frac{\delta X}{\delta \Phi}\frac{\delta Y}{\delta \Phi^*} - (-1)^{\epsilon(X)+1} \frac{\delta X}{\delta \Phi^*}\frac{\delta Y}{\delta \Phi} \Big) \tag{43}$$

where ϵ denotes the statistics (1 for fermions, 0 for bosons). In terms of the bracket (43) one has

$$\mathcal{S}(\Gamma) = \frac{1}{2}(\Gamma,\Gamma) = 0\,. \tag{44}$$

Under eq.(43) the fields and the antifields are paired via the fundamental brackets

$$(\Phi_i, \Phi^*_j) = (-1)^{\epsilon(\Phi_j)}\delta_{ij}\,. \tag{45}$$

The conventions on the antifields differs from the one of [9] by the redefinition $\Phi^* \to (-1)^{\epsilon(\Phi)}\Phi^*$, whence the sign factor in the r.h.s. of the above equation.

A redefinition of the fields and the antifields respecting eq.(45) preserves the bracket between any two functionals X, Y and hence also the functional identity (40). Such a redefinition is called a canonical transformation (w.r.t. the bracket (43)).

The easiest way to work out the appropriate canonical transformation is to make use of the finite canonical transformation generated by the functional $G = \int d^4x \sum_{\Phi'} (-1)^{\epsilon(\Phi')} \Phi^{*'} \Phi'(\Phi)$ [9]. The field transformations fix the dependence of G on the new antifields, while the antifield redefinitions are obtained by solving the equations

$$\Phi^* = (-1)^{\epsilon(\Phi)} \frac{\delta G}{\delta \Phi}\,, \quad \Phi' = (-1)^{\epsilon(\Phi')} \frac{\delta G}{\delta \Phi^{*'}}\,. \tag{46}$$

By explicit computation one finds

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde e^{0*} &= Z_1 \tilde e^{0*'} + Z_7 \tilde\varphi_+^{a*'} \tilde b^a + Z_{12} \tilde\varphi_+^{0*'} \tilde b^0\,,\\
\tilde e^{a*} &= Z_1 \tilde e^{a*'} - Z_7 \tilde\varphi_+^{a*'} \tilde b^0 + Z_7 \varepsilon^{abc} \tilde\varphi_+^{b*'} \tilde b^c + Z_{12} \tilde\varphi_+^{0*'} \tilde b^a\,,\\
\tilde A_\mu^{a*} &= Z_2 A_\mu^{a*'} - Z_5 \partial^\mu \tilde\varphi_+^{a*'} + \frac{Z_6}{m} \partial_\mu h \tilde\varphi_+^{a*'} + 2 Z_{11} \tilde\varphi_+^{0*'} A^a_\mu\,,\\
\varphi^{0*} &= z_1 \varphi^{0*'} + 2 z_2 (\varphi_0 + \mu) \varphi^{0*'}\,, \qquad \varphi^{a*} = z_1 \varphi^{a*'} + 2 z_2 \varphi^a \varphi^{0*'}\,,
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\varphi}_+^{a*} &= Z_4 \tilde{\varphi}_+^{a*'} , \qquad \tilde{\varphi}_+^{0*} = Z_8 \tilde{\varphi}_+^{0*'} , \\
\tilde{b}^{a*} &= -Z_7 \tilde{\varphi}_+^{a*'} \tilde{e}^0 + Z_7 \varepsilon^{abc} \tilde{\varphi}_+^{b*'} \tilde{e}^c - Z_{12} \tilde{\varphi}_+^{0*'} \tilde{e}^a + Z_m \tilde{b}^{a*'} , \\
\tilde{b}^{0*} &= Z_7 \tilde{\varphi}_+^{a*'} \tilde{e}^a - Z_{12} \tilde{\varphi}_+^{0*'} \tilde{e}^0 + Z_m \tilde{b}^{0*'} , \\
h^* &= -\frac{Z_6}{m} \tilde{\varphi}_+^{a*'} \partial A^a - \frac{Z_6}{m} \partial_\mu \tilde{\varphi}_+^{a*'} A^{a\mu} + \frac{Z_9}{m} \Box \tilde{\varphi}_+^{0*'} \\
&\quad - 2\frac{Z_{10}}{m^2} \Box h \tilde{\varphi}_+^{0*'} - 2\frac{Z_{10}}{m^2} \partial^\mu \tilde{\varphi}_+^{0*'} \partial_\mu h + Z_m Z_3 h^{*'} .
\end{aligned} \tag{47}
$$

Consequently the functional

$$
\begin{aligned}
\hat{\Gamma}[g', m', t', \tilde{t}', \alpha', \beta', \lambda'; \Phi', \Phi^{*'}] = \Gamma^{(0)}[&Z_g g, Z_m m, Z_t t, Z_{\tilde{t}'} \tilde{t}, Z_\alpha / Z_m^2 \alpha, Z_\beta / Z_g Z_m \beta, Z_\lambda \lambda; \\
&\Phi(\Phi'), \Phi^*(\Phi', \Phi^{*'})]
\end{aligned} \tag{48}
$$

is the most general solution to eq.(40) compatible with power-counting bounds. One can verify it by explicit calculations.

It finally remains to be shown that the UV divergences can be recursively reabsorbed by a change in the parameters $Z_g, Z_m, Z_t, Z_{\tilde{t}'}, Z_\alpha, Z_\beta, Z_\lambda$ and field renormalization constants Z_j, $j = 1, \ldots, 12$, z_j, $j = 1, 2$, order by order in the loop expansion. This technical proof is left to Appendix A.

6 Comparison with the usual formulation.

We proved above that the renormalized Higgs-Kibble model is described by the gauge invariant Lagrangian and generates the scattering matrix which is unitary in the space including three components of the massive Yang-Mills field and one massive scalar particle.

Now we show that in the framework of perturbation theory the scattering matrix obtained above may be transformed to the ususal renormalizable gauges, or to nonrenormalizable unitary gauge. The comparison of our formulation with the standard one exactly coincides with the corresponding procedure for the Yang-Mills theory [7]. For that reason we shall not repeat the proof. As in the Yang-Mills case our scattering matrix may be presented as the path integral

$$
S = \int \exp\{i \int [L_{g.i.}(x) + \lambda^a \varphi_-^a] d^4x\} \det(M^{ab}) d\mu , \tag{49}
$$

where $L_{g.i.}$ denotes the gauge invariant Lagrangian entering the effective action (37), and

$$
\det(M^{ab})^{-1}|_{\varphi_-^a = 0} = \int \delta((\varphi_-^\Omega)^a) d\Omega \tag{50}
$$

and the vacuum boundary conditions may be adopted for the auxilliary fields $\varphi_\pm, e, b$. Multiplying the integral (49) by "1"

$$
1 = \Delta_L \int \delta(\partial_\mu A_\mu^\Omega) d\Omega \tag{51}
$$

and changing the variables $\Phi^\Omega \to \Phi$ we arrive to the expression for the scattering matrix in the gauge $\partial_\mu A_\mu = 0$:

$$S = \int \exp\{i \int [L_{g.i.}(x) + \lambda^a(x)\partial_\mu A^a_\mu(x) + \partial_\mu \bar{c}^a (D_\mu c)^a] d^4x\} d\mu \tag{52}$$

As the vacuum boundary conditions were adopted for the fields $\varphi_\pm, e, b$, we can integrate out all these fields and obtain the standard expression for the scattering matrix of the Higgs-Kibble model in the gauge $\partial_\mu A_\mu = 0$. In the same way one can consider (again in the framework of perturbation theory) other renormalizable gauges.

Finally we mention that the independence on the choice of the gauge holds also for expectation values of other gauge invariant operators.

7 Discussion

In this paper we showed that the Higgs-Kibble model may be formulated in the close analogy with the pure Yang-Mills theory. The corresponding theory is renormalizable and ambiguity free. Hence we conclude that the appearance of the ambiguity in the standard procedure is the artefact of the quantization procedure. Of course the final answer to the question of the physical importance of the Gribov ambiguity may be given only beyond perturbation theory.

Acknowledgements.

One of us (A.Q.) gratefully acknowledges partial financial support from University of Milano. The work of A.A.S. was partially supported by Russian Basic Research Foundation under grant 09-01-12150-офи_м and RAS program "Nonlinear dynamics".

A Recursive Removal of the UV Divergences

In this Appendix we show that the UV divergences of the model can be reabsorbed order by order in the loop expansion by a suitable choice of the parameters $Z_g, Z_m, Z_t, Z_\alpha, Z_\beta, Z_\lambda$ and field renormalization constants Z_j, $j = 1, \dots, 12$, z_j, $j = 1, 2$.

The proof closely parallels the one already presented in [7] for the massless Yang-Mills theory and thus we will only sketch the main points here.

Suppose that the subtraction of the divergences has been performed up to order $n-1$ in the loop expansion while preserving the residual global $SU(2)$ invariance and eq.(39). Then at order n eq.(39) gives

$$\mathcal{S}_0(\Gamma^{(n)}) \equiv \int d^4x \sum_\Phi \Big(\frac{\delta\Gamma^{(0)}}{\delta\Phi^*(x)} \frac{\delta}{\delta\Phi(x)} + \frac{\delta\Gamma^{(0)}}{\delta\Phi(x)} \frac{\delta}{\delta\Phi^*(x)} \Big) \Gamma^{(n)} =$$

$$- \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \int d^4x \sum_\Phi \frac{\delta\Gamma^{(n-j)}}{\delta\Phi^*(x)} \frac{\delta\Gamma^{(j)}}{\delta\Phi(x)} \tag{53}$$

The second line of the above equation is finite since it contains only lower order terms which have already been subtracted. Hence one gets the following equation for the divergent part $\Gamma^{(n)}_{div}$ at order n

$$\mathcal{S}_0(\Gamma^{(n)}_{div}) = 0\,. \tag{54}$$

The operator $\mathcal{S}_0$ is defined by the first line of eq.(53). Since the antifield Φ^* is coupled in $\Gamma^{(0)}$ to the transformation of the field Φ in eq.(21), the $\mathcal{S}_0$-variation of Φ coincides with $\delta\Phi$ in eq.(21):

$$\mathcal{S}_0\Phi = \frac{\delta\Gamma^{(0)}}{\delta\Phi^*} = \delta\Phi\,. \tag{55}$$

From eq.(53) one also sees that $\mathcal{S}_0$ acts on the antifield Φ^* by mapping it into the classical e.o.m. of Φ, namely

$$\mathcal{S}_0\Phi^* = \frac{\delta\Gamma^{(0)}}{\delta\Phi}\,. \tag{56}$$

$\mathcal{S}_0$ is nilpotent, as a consequence of the nilpotency of δ and the validity of the functional identity eq.(39) for $\Gamma^{(0)}$.

The most general solution to eq.(54) can be written as

$$\Gamma^{(n)}_{div} = A + \mathcal{S}_0 B \tag{57}$$

where A cannot be presented in the form $\mathcal{S}_0 C$, with C a local functional. $\Gamma^{(n)}$ is invariant under the global residual $SU(2)$ symmetry preserved by the regularization. Since $\Gamma^{(n)}$ is a Lorentz invariant functional, the functionals A and B also possess this invariance.

There is a general strategy for obtaining the most general solution of the A-type. This relies on the evaluation of the cohomology $H_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{S}_0)$ [12] of the nilpotent operator $\mathcal{S}_0$ in the space $\mathcal{F}$ of Lorentz- and global $SU(2)$-invariant local functionals with dimension bounded by the power-counting. $H_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{S}_0)$ is defined as the quotient of the latter functional space w.r.t. to the equivalence relation

$$X \sim Y \Leftrightarrow X - Y = \mathcal{S}_0(C) \tag{58}$$

for some Lorentz- and global $SU(2)$-invariant local functional C.

The first step in the computation of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{S}_0)$ is the identification of the so-called doublet variables. A pair of variables u, v such that $\mathcal{S}_0 u = v\,, \mathcal{S}_0 v = 0$ is called a $\mathcal{S}_0$-doublet. Their importance stems from the fact that the dependence on u, v can only happen via the term $\mathcal{S}_0 B$ in eq.(57), as a consequence of a general theorem valid for nilpotent differentials [11, 13]. It is easy to see that the pairs $(h, -\tilde{b}^0)$, $(\tilde{e}^a, \frac{g}{2m}(\tilde{e}^a\tilde{b}^0 - \tilde{e}^0\tilde{b}^a - \varepsilon^{abc}\tilde{e}^b\tilde{b}^c) + \tilde{\varphi}^a_+)$, $(\tilde{e}^0, \frac{g}{2m}(\tilde{e}^a\tilde{b}^a + \tilde{e}^0\tilde{b}^0) + \tilde{\varphi}^0_+)$ satisfy the definition of $\mathcal{S}_0$-doublets. Moreover the doublet partners of $\tilde{e}^0, \tilde{e}^a$ are in one-to-one correspondence with $\tilde{\varphi}^0_+, \tilde{\varphi}^a_+$ (via an invertible field redefinition). Hence we conclude that the dependence of the most general solution to eq.(54) on $h, \tilde{e}^a, \tilde{e}^0$ and $\tilde{b}^0, \tilde{\varphi}^a_+, \tilde{\varphi}^0_+$ is confined to the term

$\mathcal{S}_0 B$. We remark that a similar result also holds in the massless Yang-Mills theory in the ambiguity-free gauge [7].

Since the dependence on the doublets is confined to the $\mathcal{S}_0 B$-sector, we can now consider the restriction of $\mathcal{S}_0$ to the subspace without doublets (and their antifields).

In this latter subspace the action of $\mathcal{S}_0$ is the same as the one of the standard gauge BRST transformation of the Higgs model for the gauge group $SU(2)$, once one identifies the $SU(2)$ BRST ghosts with $\frac{1}{m}\tilde{b}_a$, as was done in eq.(21).

By taking into account power-counting bounds, the class of A-type solutions is exhausted by the gauge-invariant polynomials in the gauge field A^a_μ and the Higgs doublet φ of dimension less or equal than four [12], i.e.

$$\Gamma^{(n)}_{div} = \int d^4x \Big(a_1^{(n)} F^a_{\mu\nu} F^a_{\mu\nu} + a_2^{(n)} (D_\mu\varphi)^* (D_\mu \varphi) + a_3^{(n)} (\varphi^*\varphi - \mu^2)^2 + a_4^{(n)} (\varphi^*\varphi - \mu^2) \Big) . \tag{59}$$

The divergent coefficients $a_j^{(n)}$ can be reabsorbed by a redefinition of Z_g, z_1, Z_λ and Z_t respectively.

The enumeration of the solutions of the type $\mathcal{S}_0 B$ goes as follows. There are two classes of this kind of solutions: those which do not depend on the antifields and those which depend on the antifields. The first ones are obtained in terms of the following operator insertions

$$\mathcal{J}_m = \delta Z_m^{(n)} \frac{\partial}{\partial Z_m}\hat{\Gamma} \, , \quad \mathcal{J}_\alpha = \delta Z_\alpha^{(n)} \frac{\partial}{\partial Z_\alpha}\hat{\Gamma} \, , \quad \mathcal{J}_\beta = \delta Z_\beta^{(n)} \frac{\partial}{\partial Z_\beta}\hat{\Gamma} \, , \quad \mathcal{J}_{\tilde{t}} = \delta Z_{\tilde{t}}^{(n)} \frac{\partial}{\partial Z_{\tilde{t}}}\hat{\Gamma} \, , \tag{60}$$

where $\delta Z_m^{(n)}$, $\delta Z_\alpha^{(n)}$, $\delta Z_\beta^{(n)}$, $\delta Z_{\tilde{t}}^{(n)}$ are divergent coefficients of order n. They can be reabsorbed by a redefinition of $Z_m, Z_\alpha, Z_\beta, Z_{\tilde{t}}$ respectively.

The invariants of the $\mathcal{S}_0 B$-type involving the antifields are of the form (no sum over Φ)

$$w_j^{(n)} \int d^4x \, \mathcal{S}_0(\Phi^* F_j(\Phi)) = w_j^{(n)} \int d^4x \Big(F_j(\Phi) \frac{\delta \Gamma^{(0)}}{\delta\Phi} - \Phi^* \frac{\delta F_j}{\delta \Phi} \mathcal{S}_0 \Phi \Big) \tag{61}$$

where again the divergent coefficients $w_j^{(n)}$ are of order $\hbar^n$.The possible F_j's, $j = 1, \dots, 14$ in eq.(61) are constrained by the rigid symmetries of the theory, quantum numbers and power-counting and have the same structure as the corresponding terms in eq.(42). They can be reabsorbed by a n-th order redefinition of the field renormalization constants Z_j, $j = 1, \dots, 12$ and z_j, $j = 1, 2$, as it can be seen from the first term in the r.h.s. of eq.(61). The corresponding redefinition of the antifields in the second term of eq.(61) is automatically taken into account by the associated antifield redefinition in eq.(47).

Once the divergences have been symmetrically removed up to order n, the procedure can be iterated at order $n + 1$. This completes the proof that indeed renormalization does not spoil eq.(39) and the residual global SU(2) invariance. Therefore we conclude that the renormalized theory is unitary in the subspace including the transverse degree of freedom of the massive gauge field and the physical scalar Higgs mode.

References

[1] V. N. Gribov, Nucl. Phys. B **139** (1978) 1.

[2] I. M. Singer, Commun. Math. Phys. **60** (1978) 7.

[3] Higgs P.W. Phys.Lett.12 (1964) 132.

[4] Kibble T.W.B. Phys.Rev.155 (1967) 1554.

[5] A. A. Slavnov, JHEP **0808** (2008) 047 [arXiv:0807.1795 [hep-th]].

[6] A. A. Slavnov, Theor. Math. Phys. **161** (2009) 204.

[7] A. Quadri and A. A. Slavnov, JHEP **1007** (2010) 087 [arXiv:1002.2490 [hep-th]].

[8] J. Zinn-Justin, Renormalization of Gauge Theories. Lectures given at Int. Summer Inst. for Theoretical Physics, Jul 29 - Aug 9, 1974, Bonn, West Germany. Published in Bonn Conf.1974:2 (QCD161:I83:1974)

[9] W. Troost, P. van Nieuwenhuizen and A. Van Proeyen, Nucl. Phys. B **333** (1990) 727.

[10] J. Gomis, J. Paris and S. Samuel, Phys. Rept. **259** (1995) 1 [arXiv:hep-th/9412228].

[11] G. Barnich, F. Brandt and M. Henneaux, Phys. Rept. **338** (2000) 439 [arXiv:hep-th/0002245].

[12] G. Barnich and M. Henneaux, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72** (1994) 1588 [arXiv:hep-th/9312206]; G. Barnich, F. Brandt and M. Henneaux, Commun. Math. Phys. **174** (1995) 57 [arXiv:hep-th/9405109]; Commun. Math. Phys. **174** (1995) 93 [arXiv:hep-th/9405194].

[13] A. Quadri, JHEP **0205**, 051 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0201122].